N

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,429	08/25/2000		Jordan J. Louviere	M-9235 US	6023

				EXAMINER
22874	7590	03/17/2004		PRIETO, BEATRIZ

BRADLEY M GANZ, PC
P O BOX 10105
PORTLAND, OR 97296

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2142	12

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
> THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
>   after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
>   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
>   earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>02 January 2004</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
   closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 15-82</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-13 and 15-82</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

   1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
      application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.　　This communication is in response to amendment filed 01/24/04, claims 1-13, 15-82 remain pending on instant application and are hereby set forth for examination.

2.　　Quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action may be found in previous office action.

3.　　Claims 1-13, 15-82 are rejected under USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Herz U.S. Patent No. 6,460,036.

Regarding claim 15,

　　　a method, which monitors and collect (i.e. "gauge") user reaction to various data of content elements (Herz: monitored user behavior see col 17/lines 30-col 18/line 27 and collect statistics on user behavior see col 41/line 63-col 42/line 20, measure user reaction see col 7/lines 27-31);

　　　conducting experiment over the network (col 29/lines 67-col 30/line 6, over the network col 31/lines 39-col 32/line 2);

　　　collect over the data network observation data relating to the user behavior for each treatment (col 31/line 59-col 32/line 2, gather observation data see col 18/lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 16, identifying desired objectives for user behavior (benefit desired; col 5/lines 42-4, 50-54, objective, col 31/lines 55-59);

　　　identifying which treatments may likely to effect (influence) user behavior to achieve the desired objectives (col 18/lines 28-51, identify, col 17/lines 30-33); and

　　　generating the various treatments using different combinations of the content elements (different combination areas of interest col 5/lines 13-22, different combination types of content, col 29/lines 37-53).

Regarding claim 17, defining a content attribute ("control variable") for the various treatments (col 21/lines 47-49, col 21/lines 61-col 22/line 5); and assigning a respective weight ("level") for the control variable for each treatment (col 21/lines 61-col 22/line 5).

Regarding claim 18, selecting a target object (treatment) for delivery to users (col 6/lines 15-20, selective listing, col 5/lines 16-22);

grouping users into a plurality of groups, each of users with similar interest inferred by behavioral characteristics (col 75/lines 56-65) and using these similarities to specifying a particular segment of users to receive the selected treatment (clustering user, col 30/lines 33-39, col 20/lines 51-55).

Regarding claim 19, sampling by quantitatively recording or measuring an event or condition ("statistically sampling") to specify a plurality of ("control") user's groups based in the interest similarity of the users (col 30/lines 33-39);

specifying a particular treatment to be delivered to the user in each (control) group (col 5/lines 13-22);

receiving identical requests for the same content topic from the respective user in each of the control groups (col 76/lines 37-46); and

in response to the identical requests, delivering to the at least one user in each control group a different treatment associated with the interest similarity characteristic of the group (deliver col 6/lines 15-20, designate, col 5/lines 16-22).

Regarding claim 20, monitoring (observing) site related behavior of users receiving the various treatments (monitoring col 58/lines 55-col 59/line 8, col 48/lines 1-8, procedure: col 17/lines 43-col 18/lines 27).

Regarding claim 21, this claim is substantially the same as claim 10, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 22, collecting data of observed behavior of users (collect: col 31/lines 59-col 32/line 2, gather: col 18/line 25-27), each user belonging to a group ("control group") during the experiment (clustering user, col 30/lines 33-39).

Regarding claim 23, identifying elements of content, which potentially influence behavior of users (col 18/lines 28-51, identify, col 17/lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 1, Herz teaches features of the invention as claimed, teaching an automated system/method (i.e. "created/executed experiment") (Hertz: a program executed on a computer or processor, wherein the program, instructions or procedures "experiment" perform the above functions

implemented on a computer, see computer program; col 55/lines 65-col 56/line 3, col 8/lines 61-col 9/line 5, computer executable program, col 30/lines 41-44); comprising:

a method consisting of delivering data (treatment consisting of a set of content element) to users for observing user behavior with respect to the received data (i.e. a created and executed experiment) (Hertz: user's interest are derived from observer user's behavior with respect to presented data "test behavior", i.e. monitoring with respected to provided data pages viewed, repeated sites, purchases conducted, time viewing to delivered content is monitored/collected (col 17/lines 30-col 18/line 27 and collect and utilize aggregated statistics on past user behavior see col 41/line 63-col 42/line 20, treatment, i.e. data see col 29/lines 34-53, for a set of data files "content data elements", see col 5/lines 13-32);

deliver data to the user in connection with said experiment over a data network (N of Figs. 1-2) (Hertz; col 29/line 67-col 30/line 26, over the network, col 31/lines 39-col 32/line 2).

Regarding claim 2, identify elements of content, which may ("influence") affect user behavior to achieve a desired objective (col 18/lines 28-51, identify, col 17/lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 3, ("statistical sampling") quantitive measure and/or recording of a condition(s) or an event procedure(s) (col 58/line 55-col 59/line 8, col 17/lines 44-col 18/line 4) used to deliver over the data network the various treatments to respective users of a ("control") group with similar behavior characteristics (deliver: col 6/lines 15-20, designate content for delivery: col 5/lines 16-22).

Regarding claim 4, store data relating to the set of content elements (col 29/lines 34-53 for a set of content data elements col 5/lines 13-32); monitor designated user behavior (col 31/lines 59-col 32/line 2, col 18/line 25-27); and designate users to receive treatment during the experiment (col 31/lines 59-col 32/line 2, col 18/line 25-27).

Regarding claim 5, software ("an experiment manager object") operable to perform or manage ("control") the execution of the experiment (col 8/lines 61-col 9/line 5, computer, col 30/lines 41-44).

Regarding claim 6, executable software ("experiment engine comprises an experiment manager object") configured to specify different treatments of content associated with different areas of interest (col 6/lines 15-20, designate, col 5/lines 16-22).

Application/Control Number: 09/648,429 (LOUVIERE et. al.)
Art Unit: 2142

Page 4

Regarding claim 7, executable software configured to define and implement ("statistical") sampling (collection of information regarding an event) procedures conducted in orderly or methodically fashion (col 17/lines 45-col 18/line 4, methodically monitoring, col 58/lines 55-col 59/line 8).

Regarding claim 8, record the experiment under way and the participating users whose behavior was monitored (collect: col 31/lines 59-col 32/line 2, gather: col 18/line 25-27) and which are later grouped based on recorded experiment (col 30/lines 33-39, col 20/lines 51-55).

Regarding claim 9, store experiment data (col 31/lines 59-col 32/line 2, col 18/line 25-27).

Regarding claim 10, Internet data network supporting WWW applications (col 28/lines 64-col 29/line 11).

Regarding claim 11, collect data relating user behavior to each presented data (Herz: collect over the data network observation data relating to the user behavior for each treatment (col 31/line 59-col 32/line 2, gather observation data see col 18/lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 12, generate a set of criteria, predictions, derived estimates or similarity ("experiment rules") for allocating treatments during the experiment (col 18/lines 32-40, col 5/lines 32-48).

Regarding claim 13, software ("interface") operable to allow a user to interact with the method/system (col 29/lines 4-10).

Regarding claim 24, this claim includes limitation substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1 and 15, same rationale of rejection is applicable, further limitation(s) include,

a ("content") system (SS$_1$ of Fig. 2) and its supportive software implementation ("script") for storing a set of content elements (col 29/lines 4-18); and

a ("communication management") system (V$_1$ of Fig. 2) and its supportive software implementation (col 29/lines 4-11) in communication with the content system and operable to implement the experiment (col 29/lines 67-col 30/line 26), the method discussed on claims 1 and 22.

Regarding claim 25-27, these claims are substantially the same as claims 2-3 and 12, respectively, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 28, wherein the content system is operable to distribute, deliver or designate ("allocate") treatments to users according to the predictions or derived estimates ("experiment rules") (deliver, col 6/lines 15-20, designate, col 5/lines 16-22).

Regarding claim 29, this claim is substantially the same as limitation(s) discussed on claim 18, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 30, accessing content element over said data network comprises the Internet (col 28/lines 64-col 29/line 11, col 30/line 66-67, Internet providers).

Regarding claim 31, this claim is substantially the same as claim 17, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 32, the content system and the communication management system are distributed over the data network (Figs. 1-2, col 29/lines 4-18, col 29/lines 67-col 30/line 26).

Regarding claim 33, executable software ("allocator module") operable to support access or communication ("interface") with the communication management system (col 19/lines 4-11).

Regarding claim 34, executable software ("allocator interface object") operable to support access or communication ("interface") with the content system (col 19/lines 4-32).

Regarding claim 35, a content provider ("interface)" operable to support an access or communication ("interface") between the communication management system and a ("manager") user (col 29/lines 4-32).

Regarding claim 36, this claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1, 3-4 and 15, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 37-39, these claims comprise limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claims 2-3 and 10, respectively same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Application/Control Number: 09/648,429 (LOUVIERE et. al.)
Art Unit: 2142

Page 6

Regarding claim 40, this claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those as claim 36, where claim 36 comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1, 3-4 and 15, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 41, this claim is substantially the same as claim 10, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 42, identifying files ("elements of content') which ("potentially") may influence behavior of users achieve a desired objective (col 18/lines 28-51, identify, col 17/lines 30-33).

Regarding claim 43, this claim comprises limitation(s) substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1, 3, 7, 15, 19, 24, 15, same rationale of rejection is applicable, further limitations include providing a website (I_1) on a data network (N)(Fig. 2);

receiving requests (Fig. 16, step 1602) for content (col 67/lines 40-50) from users accessing the website (col 76/lines 30-37) on the data network;

allocating over the data network a second treatment to each user not in the control group (col 20/lines 51-55, col 22/lines 44-46);

collecting observation data for observed behavior of users not in the control group (col 22/lines 1-5, 31-46).

Regarding claim 44, this claim is substantially the same as claim 2, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 45, a website providing a web page at which the set of filed are is available (col 76/lines 30-37) in the form of any of the treatments (col 29/lines 34-53, col 5/lines 13-32).

Regarding claim 46, this claim is substantially the same as claim 10, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 47-48, substantially the same as claims 45-46, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 49, substantially the same as claim 2, 16 23, 25, 42, 44, same rationale of rejection is applicable, influence user behavior based on collected user behavior, (Hertz: col 50/lines45-61).

Application/Control Number: 09/648,429 (LOUVIERE et. al.)
Art Unit: 2142

Page 7

Regarding claim 50, a processor ("model engine") to determine what data is most suitable for achieving a desired outcome (Herz: determine data that is highly relevant to the user, i.e. most suitable for achieving desire outcome, e.g. profit see col 5/lines 42-54, 63-65).

Regarding claim 51, allocated created data (identify and generate data see col 18/lines 28-51, col 17/lines 30-33, col 5/lines 13-22 and col 29/lines 37-53), said data used measure user behavior or response to provided data and collecting observed behavior (Herz: collect user behavior data see col 31/line 59-col 32/line 2, gather observation data see col 18/lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 52, determine how content drives user behavior (Hertz: determine what content is relevant to the user to based on past user behavior in order to influence ("drive") user behavior, see col 5/lines 13-22, 25-32, 42-54, 63-65, col 3/lines 3-20, col 7/lines 27-31, 60-64).

Regarding claim 53, rules that dictate how data is allocated to a user (Hertz: rules that determine which data is allocated to the user in accordance to obtained user behavior feedback see col 17/lines 30-col 18/line 28).

Regarding claim 54, create and provide or deliver data to users (Hertz: delivery process see col 6/lines 3-20), capturing data relating to the observer behavior of the user with respect to the data (Herz: monitor behavior and collect user behavior see col 31/line 59-col 32/line 2, gather observation data see col 18/lines 25-27).

Regarding claim 55-56, this claim is substantially the same as 52-53, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 57, this claim is the machine readable medium including a set of instructions for performing the method of the computer implementation discussed on claim 54, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 58-59, substantially the same as claim 55-56, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claims 60-62, substantially the same as claims 27-28, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 63, analyzing captured observed data using a technique to determine what data content influences the probability of an outcome in terms of user behavior (Hertz: observer data using a relevance feedback technique see col 17/lines 30-col 18/line 25, used for determining what data content influence the probability of data high relevant to the user see col 18/lines 49-62, this matching of data to the user based on his behavior is desired in order to achieve the benefits desired by the content provider, marketers and advertisers see col 5/lines 13-32, 42-54, 63-65).

Regarding claim 64, functions discussed on claims 1 and 15 are execute by a program (Herz: see computer program; col 55/lines 65-col 56/line 3, col 8/lines 61-col 9/line 5, computer executable program, col 30/lines 41-44).

Regarding claims 65-66, generating a prediction which anticipates behavior of the user based upon observation data on user's past behavior (Herz: probability of an outcome (e.g. for retailers) is achieved using a prediction technique for purposes of predicting both the nature and relative quantity of items which are likely to be popular to user's, this predictions is based on observation data see col 71/lines 25-55 and user is predicted based on previous behavior see col 69/lines 14-28, predict use's behavior see col 41/lines 63-67).

Regarding claim 67, deliver data to users according to the model for predicting user behavior in order to optimize a desired outcome (Herz: probability of an outcome (e.g. for retailers) is achieved using a prediction technique for purposes of predicting both the nature and relative quantity of items which are likely to be popular to user's, this predictions is based on observation data see col 71/lines 25-55).

Regarding claim 68, customized content (Herz: abstract).

Regarding claim 69, clustering or grouping users with similar behavioral characteristics (e.g. interest or profiles) (Herz: col 41/lines 65-col 42/line 5, clustering users based on their similarity behavior interest see col 76/lines 25-56).

Regarding claim 70, delivering data to user with specific behavioral characteristics, i.e. a "rule" (Hertz: selection of data to be delivered to the user with specific behavior characteristic based on past behavior, e.g. user activity within a specific category of interest, i.e. profiling see col 6/lines 63-col 7/line 15)

Application/Control Number: 09/648,429 (LOUVIERE et. al.)
Art Unit: 2142

Page 9

Regarding claim 71, user interface browser (Hertz: col 7/lines 49-col 8/line 9)

Regarding claim 72, this claim comprises limitations that are substantially the same as those discussed on claims 1, 15, 24 and claim 6, discussed above, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 73, generating means ("rule") for delivering data to users with specific behavioral characteristics (Hertz: col 6/lines 63-col 7/line 15).

Regarding claim 74, deliver data to users based on prediction rules (Hertz; col 6/lines 63-col 7/line 15).

Regarding claim 75, a system implements a process for customizing content (Hertz: abstract).

Regarding claim 76, this claim includes limitations discussed on claim 2-3, 63, 65-66, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 77, substantially the same as claim 2, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 78, is a combination of previous limitation(s) of claims 63 and 65-67, same rationale of rejections is applicable

Regarding claims 79-80, claims 11, 15, 50, 65-67, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Regarding claim 81-82, substantially the same as claims 65-67, same rationale of rejection is applicable.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant argues prior art does not teach managing presenting data to a user in a an experiment, because the Hertz reference monitors what a user accesses but does not manage the presentation of various treatments to users to assess user behavior, reactions or choices with respect to presented treatments that are managed through the experimentation system.

In response to the above-mentioned argument, claim 1 reads a program that observes the behavior of user to data and means to deliver data over the network to a user regarding the program. It is respectfully noted that applicant is entitled to be his/her own lexicographer (see MPEP §2111). According

Application/Control Number: 09/648,429 (LOUVIERE et. al.)
Art Unit: 2142

Page 10

to applicant's specification experiment engine is a program that when executed provides the experiment's functions, the experiment engine supports the creation and execution of an experiment (i.e. a program that when executed performs the functions of the so called "experiment"), consisting of delivering data to the user and observer his/her behavior with respect to presented data. Claimed "experiment engine", now called "communication management system" is simply a program, now a system that provides the functionality of monitoring user behavior to presented data (see page 16, lines 4-22). Any method with corresponding computer implementation, i.e. computer readable medium storing the program that when executed by a processor performs monitoring user behavior to presented data reads on claimed language of claim 1. The Herz reference reads on this.

Specifically, Hertz teaches a program that when executed perform the functions of a disclosed method (col 55/lines 65-col 56/line 3, col 8/lines 61-col 9/line 5, computer executable program, col 30/lines 41-44) the method comprising: delivering data (treatment consisting of a set of content element) to users for observing user behavior with respect to the received data (col 17/lines 30-col 18/line 27) over a network (N of Fig. 1) (col 29/line 67-col 30/line 26, over the network, col 31/lines 39-col 32/line 2) and monitor/collect user behavior data (col 41/line 63-col 42/line 20).

5.   Applicant argues prior art of record nowhere teaches what target object are to be created, executed or presented to users so that user behaviors may be evaluated.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies are nowhere recited in the rejected claim 1. This is not a suggestion of any sort. Further, it is noted that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

6.   It is noted that added/amended claims are broad, thereby they do clearly not reflect critical features of the invention and simply prolong prosecution. Ambiguity in the claims opens the door to various forms of interpretation in light of the specification, this should be avoided to overcome any prior art.

7.   Claim 1 is rejected under USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Testing Web Site Design and Promotional Content, Dreze et. al., Aug 1998, pages 1-43 (Dreze hereafter).

Regarding claim 1, Dreze teaches a system that monitors user behavior to various data of content and delivers over a data network said data (page 28-30, monitor and measure user behavior see pages 7-12, test see 13-15, collect see page 15-17, identify element that influence user behavior related to desire objective, page 17-19, what target object are to be created, executed or presented to users so that user behaviors may be influence, i.e. treatment effectiveness see page 17-19).

8.   Claim 15 is rejected under USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Moving usability testing on the Web, Svensson et. al., 1998, pages 1-8 (Svensson hereafter).

Regarding claim 15, defining an test for measuring user reaction to various treatments for a set of content (abstract), conduction the test over the Web (page 1-2, page 4), collecting over the Web observation data relating to user behavior for presented treatment (page 1-3).

Pertinent Prior Art:

9.   The following prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure; pertinence is presented in accordance with MPEP§ 707.05. Copies of documents cited will be provided as set forth in MPEP§ 707.05(a):

U.S. Robinson 5,918,014 (06-1999)

Robinson teaches a system/method for identify elements of content which may influence user behavior, specify different treatment of content gauge user reaction to various treatments of data delivered over the Internet and collect observation data relating the user behavior for each treatment. Predict user behavior, i.e. tendency based in collect observation data which will show a tendency for such behavior in the future. User with similar behavior characteristics are denoted communities. Determining user behavior and the content to allocate, i.e. deliver on the basis of collected user behaviors.

U.S. Patent No. 5,848,396 (12-1998)

Gerace teaches a program which classifies aspect of content presentation, this aspect or classification allows direct user behavior analysis and psychographics profiling. Constructing Page Display object containing agate information for display on a screen for measuring user behavior. Collecting user behavior such as click through and corresponding position of cursor with respect to user's behavior motion and movements, the sequence and or of action the screen viewed, the item selected, its position in the screen, i.e. orientation are all behavior and content characteristic that are utilized to optimize a desire objective.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.- Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Prosecution of this application is closed by means of this final office action § 1.113, applicant may request continued examination of the application by filing a Request for Continued Examination of under 37 CFR § 1.114 and providing the corresponding fee set forth in § 1.17(e) for the submission of, but not limited to, new arguments, an information disclosure statement, an amendment to the written description, claims, drawings, or new evidence in support of patentability.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prieto, B. whose telephone number is (703) 305-0750. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 3:30 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, Jack B. Harvey can be reached on (703) 305-9705. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800/4700.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

> Box AF
> Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
> Washington, D.C. 20231

> or faxed to the Central Fax Office:
>   (703) 872-9306, for Official communications and entry

> Or Telephone:
>   (703) 306-5631 for TC 2100 Customer Service Office

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

B. Prieto
Patent Examiner

JACK B. HARVEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER